

Appl. No.: 09/504,660
Reply to Office Action of October 17, 2003

Atty. Docket No.: RTN2-047PUS
(formerly 07206-047001)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration is hereby requested.

Claim 32 points out that the transistor has a resistive layer disposed over the Schottky layer and a contact layer disposed over the resistive layer, **the contact layer having a first recess, and the resistive layer and the Schottky layer having a second recess.**

The claim stands rejected as being obvious over Hur et al. in view of Ando.


It is first noted that Hur et al. has a double recess, but both recesses are in the Schottky layer. Thus, Hur et al. does not have a device with **the contact layer having a first recess, and the resistive layer and the Schottky layer having a second recess.**

It is next noted that Ando is a single recess device and that the layer over the Schottky layer 96 in figure 9 is an **n doped** layer 97. The **n doped** layer 97 is not described as, nor is such **n doped** layer inherently, a resistive layer. Further, there is nothing in either Hur et al., or Ando, taken either singly or in combination, which suggests providing **both** the **resistive layer and the Schottky layer with a second recess.**

In the event any additional fee is required, please charge such amount to Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 50-0845.

1-15-04
Date

Respectfully submitted,


Richard M. Sharkansky
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No.: 25,800
Daly, Crowley, & Mofford, LLP
275 Turnpike Street, Suite 101
Canton, MA 02021-2354
Telephone: (781) 401-9988, 23
Facsimile: (781) 401-9966